

University of Northern Iowa
UNI ScholarWorks

Documents - Faculty Senate

Faculty Senate

11-11-1996

University of Northern Iowa Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes, November 11, 1996

University of Northern Iowa. Faculty Senate.

Let us know how access to this document benefits you

Copyright ©1996 Faculty Senate, University of Northern Iowa

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.uni.edu/facsenate_documents



Part of the [Higher Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

University of Northern Iowa. Faculty Senate., "University of Northern Iowa Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes, November 11, 1996" (1996). *Documents - Faculty Senate*. 822.
https://scholarworks.uni.edu/facsenate_documents/822

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate at UNI ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Documents - Faculty Senate by an authorized administrator of UNI ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@uni.edu.

FACULTY SENATE MEETING

Monday, November 11, 1996

1511

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The minutes of October 28, 1996, were approved as corrected.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Call for press identification. No members of the press were present.
2. Comments from Vice Chair Gable: Gable reminded Senators about the address by Owen Newlin on November 18, 1996, and the upcoming Board of Regent's Meeting on November 21, 1996, in Ames.
3. Comments from Provost Marlin. The Provost discussed undergraduate research opportunities at UNI. She urged faculty to encourage students conducting undergraduate research to submit abstracts to the National Center on Undergraduate Research. Information about this program is in department offices.

CONSIDERATION OF CALENDAR ITEMS FOR DOCKETING

- 629 Request for Emeritus Status from Vera Jo Siddens, Art Department, and Gordon A. Timpany, Department of Management. Primrose/Bozik moved/seconded to place at head of the docket, out of regular order. Motion carried. Docket 555.
- 630 Request from Senator Reineke that the UNI Faculty Senate invite the Cabinet, as represented by one of their members, to join the Faculty Senate at their earliest convenience in order to share with us the Cabinet's timeline for eliminating pesticides from UNI's lawn care program. Soneson/Thomas moved/seconded to place at head of the docket, out of regular order. Motion carried. Docket 556.
- 631 Request from Senator De Nault for a study of the impact of cancellation of classes with low-enrollment on the integrity and quality of educational programs. Soneson/De Nault moved/seconded to docket in regular order. Motion carried. Docket 557.

NEW BUSINESS

Calendar item 632: The Senate request a meeting with the Chair of the University Committee on Curricula and any members of the committee that can attend on November 25, 1996, for the purpose of determining the authority of the University Committee on Curricula and to review the issue of offering "Work Experience" as an experimental, zero-credit course. Soneson/De Nault moved/seconded to place at head of the docket out of regular order. Motion carried. Docket 558.

OLD BUSINESS

1. De Nault asked the representatives of the Calendar Committee about the disposition of the request made to the Calendar Committee on April 22, 1996, to study having Fall and Spring Semesters contain 15 full weeks of class with one full week of break in each. Patton responded that the Calendar Committee had not met.
2. De Nault asked when the Fall 1998 to Spring 2000 Calendar would come to the Senate for approval. Patton replied early Spring semester.
3. Gable stated that the Senate did not have authority to grant Emeritus Status to Merlin Taylor because he was not faculty. De Nault/Thomas moved/seconded to ask the personnel office to design three forms for requesting emeritus status; One form for faculty, one form for staff, and one form for administrators. Motion carried.
4. Primrose/Cooper moved/seconded to remove Docket Item 527, Calendar Item 600, Report of the Intercollegiate Athletics Advisory Council, from the table. Motion carried. After discussion with Tom Berg, Chair of the Intercollegiate Athletics Advisory Council, Chris Ritrievi, Director of Athletics, and Jack Wilkinson, N.C.A.A. faculty representative, Primrose/McDevitt moved/seconded to receive the report. Motion carried.

CONSIDERATION OF DOCKETED ITEMS

- 558 632 The Senate request a meeting with the Chair of the University Committee on Curricula and any members of the committee that can attend on November 25, 1996, for the purpose of determining the authority of the University Committee on Curricula and to review the issue of offering "Work Experience" as an experimental, zero-credit course. McDevitt/De Nault moved/seconded to approve the request. Motion carried.
 - 556 630 Request from Senator Reineke that the UNI Faculty Senate invite the Cabinet, as represented by one of their members, to join the Faculty Senate at their earliest convenience in order to share with us the
-

Cabinet's timeline for eliminating pesticides from UNI's lawn care program. Soneson/Van Wormer moved/seconded that the Faculty Senate invite the full Cabinet to join the Faculty Senate at their earliest convenience in order to share with us the Cabinet's timeline for eliminating pesticides from UNI's lawn care program. De Nault/Soneson moved to amend by replacing "the Cabinet's" with "whether the Cabinet has a". Motion to amend carried. De Nault/Thomas moved/seconded to substitute for the motion on the floor a motion for the Faculty Senate to invite the Cabinet to join the Faculty Senate at their earliest convenience in order to discuss elimination of pesticides from UNI's lawn care program. Motion to substitute carried. Main motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT

Primrose/Cooper moved/seconded to adjourn. Motion carried.

CALL TO ORDER

The Faculty Senate was called to order by Vice Chair Gable at 3:32 PM.

Present: Randall Krieg, Dean Primrose, Sherry Gable, Carol Cooper, Calvin Thomas, Martha Reineke, Jerome Soneson, Kenneth De Nault, Paul Shand, Suzanne McDevitt, Andrew Gilpin, Katherine Van Wormer, Barbara Weeg, Sue Grosboll, Phil Patton, and Mary Bozik (ex-officio).

Alternates: Douglas Mupasiri for Joel Haack.

Absent: Hans Isakson, Merrie Schroeder, and Richard McGuire.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Patton had previously notified the Secretary that UNI's enrollment had increased 71 students. The 621 student enrollment increase in the draft of the minutes was for all Regent's institutions. The minutes of October 28, 1996, were approved as corrected.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Call for press identification. No members of the press were present.
2. Comments from Vice Chair Gable:
 - Gable reminded Senators that Owen Newlin, President of the Board of Regents, will address the faculty on November 18, 1996, in Maucker Union at 3:30 PM. There will be a reception following. Bozik added that she is concerned that there is a good crowd. She urged Senators to attend and to encourage other faculty to also attend. She asked for one or two Senators to monitor the food during the reception. To keep expenses down, we are staffing the reception ourselves.
 - The next Board of Regent's Meeting will be November 21, 1996, in Ames.
3. Comments from Provost Marlin. The Provost discussed undergraduate research. This is a subset of last month's discussion on experiential learning. Undergraduate research is one of the most valuable sorts of experiential learning experiences we can provide for our students. It teaches how to approach questions and from this students learn that knowledge is not inert in a discipline. There are questions that lead to change. Students experience the joys and frustrations of actually doing original investigations, and other things valued in a high quality liberal educational experience, such as writing, oral communication, critical thinking, active learning, and so forth. We have been doing quite a bit of undergraduate research on the campus in the last several years and one of the things we have encouraged students to do is to get out and attend professional meetings. One of these that goes across disciplines is N. C. U. R., the National Conference on Undergraduate Research. This conference occurs every April and this year it will be in Austin, Texas April 24 to April 26. The deadline for submission of research projects is December 2, 1996. The Acting Vice President for Academic Affairs, Mahmood Yousefi, has sent information to all Deans and Departments Heads. This information should be available in the Deans and Department offices. There is also information in the Provost's office. Students who have gone to these conferences have the idea that they go, present their paper, and party. They actually end up going to all or many of the presentations because they find them interesting. There are many interesting speakers. The conference is for all disciplines, not just for scientific research. There is a format for presentations in music and dance, theater, drawing, painting, printing, photography, ceramics, video, and film. Just about

all the majors we have on campus would easily be accommodated. This is a wonderful opportunity for students. Between the Intercollegiate Academic Fund, College and Departments, we have tried to fully fund students who present papers.

Soneson asked if the funds received by Departments for experiential learning could be used to send our students to such activities. To fully fund such endeavors might cost as much as \$800.00 per student.

The Provost responded that this would be a perfect use. Typically the funding is done by some combination of funds from the Intercollegiate Academic Fund, College and Department funds. While faculty may not like it, they can afford some out-of-pocket expense to attend meetings. Students do not have this option and must be fully funded. Students who have gone thought they had the best presentation at the meeting.

Gable asked if students can get credit for this activity.

Provost Marlin replied that students can get undergraduate research credit.

De Nault stated that many Departments have a specific course in the Catalogue titled "Undergraduate Research". Undergraduate research is required for the B.S. degree.

CONSIDERATION OF CALENDAR ITEMS FOR DOCKETING

- 629 Request for Emeritus Status from Vera Jo Siddens, Art Department, and Gordon A. Timpany, Department of Management.

Primrose/Bozik moved/seconded to place at head of the docket, out of regular order. Motion carried. Docket 555.

- 630 Request from Senator Reineke that the UNI Faculty Senate invite the Cabinet, as represented by one of their members, to join the Faculty Senate at their earliest convenience in order to share with us the Cabinet's timeline for eliminating pesticides from UNI's lawn care program.

Soneson/Thomas moved/seconded to place at head of the docket, out of regular order.

Bozik asked why the item should be placed at the head of the docket.

Soneson replied that if it is placed on the docket in regular order it may take four to six weeks to get to it. Then we would have to wait for the Cabinet to get back to us for a convenient time for them to meet with us. That might be another month or two. This could be prolonged for a long, long time. This is urgent enough that we really ought to address it as soon as possible. We need to talk about the issue and determine whether or not we want to invite the Cabinet or who we might want to invite from the Cabinet so they could come as soon as possible.

Motion to place at head of the docket, out of regular order, carried. Docket 556.

- 631 Request from Senator De Nault for a study of the impact of cancellation of classes with low-enrollment on the integrity and quality of educational programs.

Soneson/De Nault moved/seconded to docket in regular order. Motion carried. Docket 557.

NEW BUSINESS

De Nault introduced Calendar item 632: The Senate request a meeting with the Chair of the University Committee on Curricula and any members of the committee that can attend on November 25, 1996 for the purpose of determining the authority of the University Committee on Curricula and to review the issue of offering "Work Experience" as an experimental, zero-credit course.

Soneson/De Nault moved/seconded to place at head of the docket out of regular order.

McDevitt asked for clarification of the issues.

De Nault stated that he was reluctant to bring a new Calendar Item to the Senate under "New Business". At the last Senate Meeting, the Provost informed Senators that the University Curricula Committee had approved for a two year period the placement of cocurricular activities on student's transcripts. Because of the considerable discussion at the last Senate meeting concerning both the authority and the appropriateness of the reported action of the University Curricula Committee, Chair Haack had agreed to investigate the situation. He had

obtained a copy of the relevant minutes of the University Curricula Committee and had forwarded a copy to Secretary De Nault. The minutes indicated that the Office of Placement and Career Services had requested authority to offer a course titled "Work Experience" as an experimental, zero-credit course. Two issues were raised at the last Senate meeting. The first issue was whether the University Curricula Committee has the authority to grant such approval or do they make recommendations to the Senate, which does have the ultimate authority on academic issues. The second issue was whether these cocurricular activities should show up on the transcript. De Nault prepared the Calendar Item so that these issues could be addressed formally by the Senate.

Gable asked what would be the course number of the "Work Experience" offering.

De Nault responded that 059, 159, and 259 are common, University-wide numbers for experimental courses.

Gable asked what would be the Departmental number.

De Nault stated that it would be "010, University, Interdisciplinary".

McDevitt asked who would supervise these students.

De Nault responded that this was one of many issues.

Bozik asked if there are any other actions of the University Curricula Committee that do not come to the Senate.

De Nault responded that he did not know. In the normal curricula process, the Senate examines new programs, majors, minors, etc., and only looks at individual courses when there is a conflict that the University Curricula Committee cannot resolve. This is an area that may need to be clarified. In the case of the "Work Experience" course, there was apparently no perceived conflict because it is to be offered by a non-academic unit. There may have been no discussion with academic area areas.

Motion to place at head of the docket, out of regular order, carried. Docket 558.

OLD BUSINESS

1. De Nault asked Patton and Bozik, members of the Calendar Committee, about the disposition of the request made to the Calendar Committee on April 22, 1996, to study having Fall and Spring Semesters contain 15 full weeks of class with one full week of break in each.

Patton responded that the Calendar Committee had not met.

2. De Nault stated that the Calendar has only been approved through Spring, 1998. He asked when the Fall 1998 to Spring 2000 Calendar would come to the Senate for approval. He did not want this issue to come to the Senate at the end of Spring Semester, like last year, when there was no time for campus discussion.

Patton replied that the proposed calendar would be to the Senate by early Spring semester.

3. Gable stated that the Senate did not have authority to grant Emeritus Status to Merlin Taylor because he was not faculty. The Senate only has authority to grant Emeritus Status to faculty.

Reineke asked if Haack was in error when he said that he had checked and there was precedent.

Gable responded that she could not speak for Haack.

Cooper stated that there are two classes of Emeritus Status, Faculty and Professional and Scientific Staff.

Soneson asked what were our options.

Gable replied that we could rescind the motion to grant Emeritus Status and forward the request to P&S.

Gable asked the P&S representatives if P&S had a procedure for granting Emeritus Status.

Patton replied that he thought that it was taken care of by the Vice President of the applicant's division.

Cooper stated that the form is the same form for both faculty and professional and scientific staff. However, it is not in the Faculty Senate's jurisdiction to be making a recommendation about Emeritus Status for P&S.

De Nault stated that the issue would be clarified if there were two forms, one for faculty and one for P&S. He asked whose forms these were.

Cooper replied that they are UNI-Personnel Form No. 2.

Gable asked Provost Marlin for assistance on the issue.

Provost Marlin stated that the forms probably come from Personnel.

Cooper corrected her earlier statement by stating that there are three groups that are eligible for Emeritus States; Faculty, Professional and Scientific Staff, and Administrators.

De Nault/Thomas moved/seconded to ask the personnel office to design three forms for requesting emeritus status; One form for faculty, one form for professional and scientific staff, and one form for administrators. Motion carried.

4. Primrose/Cooper moved/seconded to remove Docket Item 527, Calendar Item 600, Report of the Intercollegiate Athletics Advisory Council, from the table. Motion carried.

McDevitt asked about the goals of the committee.

Tom Berg, Chair of the Intercollegiate Athletics Advisory Council, stated that the Committee is now working on what effects there are on the Committee from last year's N.C.A.A. review. The Committee is currently in the process of conducting exit interviews with graduating student athletes to determine their "happiness" with the program at UNI and to determine if there are any difficulties they have had, such as problems with coaches or scheduling. Members of the Committee conduct the interviews themselves. The Committee just completed team interviews. In these interviews, members of the Committee meet with each team as a group and discuss their responsibilities as students and student athletes and inform them of the existence of the Intercollegiate Athletics Advisory Council. The student athletes are encouraged to bring concerns to the attention of the Committee. The policies regarding missed classes are also reviewed in these sessions. The Committee is very much involved in a hands-on way with the athletes, the Athletic Director, and with all people involved in the athletic program. The Committee is reviewing several issues. There is considerable unhappiness with the loss of priority registration for athletes. The Committee tries to solve disputes athletes have with faculty members. Berg felt that the Committee has an optimal working relationship with the Athletic Department, the Faculty Representative to the N.C.A.A., and the Student Athletic Advisory Council. The Committee continually strives to uphold the academic integrity of the University and yet provide these students with a quality experience in both athletics and studies.

Soneson stated that one of the items in the report was a plan that was developed and submitted to the N.C.A.A. concerning minority and gender equity. The plan is not in the report. He asked for a summary of the plan.

Chris Ritrievi, Director of Athletics, responded that as part of the certification study there was a year-long self study coupled with peer review. As part of this process, UNI was asked to submit a plan on achieving gender equity and minority equity in the future. UNI developed a comprehensive gender equity plan for the next five years. This plan includes increases in budgets and scholarship for women's sports, adjustment in positions of assistant coaches in women's sports, and also a mechanism that will require UNI to add women's sports within one year of their becoming state championship sports in the State of Iowa. In addition to that, mechanisms have been put in place to annually review the budgeting process with regard to women's sports, vis-a-vis with regard to men's sports and with regard to our competitors in the Missouri Valley Conference. The first fiscal year of this process has been completed and the program is on schedule. With regard to minority equity, a process has been developed to ensure that we are looking very carefully for minority candidates for coaching positions and administrative positions within the Athletic Department. This is a slow process because there is not a lot of turnover in the Department. In the last two years the Athletic Department has gone from two African-Americans to four African-Americans.

Cooper asked if there was an effort to increase the number of people in academic advising.

Ritrievi replied that this was a suggestion but not a recommendation in the report.

Reineke asked about the 5 year projection. She was concerned about equality of access to education that scholarships provided. She wondered what would be the mix at the end of 5 years.

Ritrievi responded that the division should be 58% men and 42% women. Ritrievi was not sure of the

present figures but they would be about 65% men and 35% women.

Cooper asked what issues might come up at the N.C.A.A. meeting that would affect the UNI athletic program.

Ritrievi responded that the big item right now is restructuring. The base of representation in N.C.A.A., particularly in I-AA is going to change. The details of restructuring will be voted on in January. UNI and other I-AA schools will not have much representation on the N.C.A.A. Board of Directors, which is made up of presidents, on the Management Council, which is made up of administrators, and the various subcommittees, which determine sports and finances. The balance of power in restructuring will have 50% of these bodies made up of representatives from I-A institutions, the large institutions, such as the Big Ten, the Big Twelve, the Pac Ten, and the Big East. The traditionally large, football-playing institutions will hold the bulk of power in the N.C.A.A. There are some protections in the restructuring. If these were not present, the restructuring proposal would not have passed. In Ritrievi's opinion, restructuring was necessary to hold the N.C.A.A. together. Otherwise, the largest 75 schools would have broken away and formed their own body. They would have taken with them all the money. This would have drastically reduced the scope of athletics in the smaller schools.

Jack Wilkinson, N.C.A.A. Faculty Representative, stated that the N.C.A.A. has done some things in the last few years regarding student welfare, but right now, this is going to be put on the back burner because of the restructuring that has just been discussed.

Ritrievi stated that the last of the academic reform packages for High School students went into effect August 1st. These are very extensive with regard to core course requirements. We have had some student athletes who did not qualify because they were at an academic performance level where they had so many options with regard to a fourth year of English that they took courses other than an English IV and technically did not meet the requirements for initial eligibility under N.C.A.A. standards. In the past, the Athletic Department always looked at the "low-end" student and made sure that student athlete had fundamentals with regard to the types of courses they took and the number of courses they took in addition to standardized test scores. We seem to have gotten to a threshold that is very extensive and very broad with regard to the core curriculum that student athletes have to take for initial eligibility. Ritrievi's sense is that we have gotten where we really need to be and there will not be more, or much more academic reform.

De Nault asked if this academic reform is only for High School students.

Retrieve replied that was correct. High School students must take a certain number of courses in various intellectual disciplines as well as achieve certain levels of test scores in order to be eligible.

De Nault asked what was the purpose in paying students to play athletics.

Ritrievi asked in what ways do we pay students to play athletics.

De Nault replied that we pay tuition, housing, books, etc.

Ritrievi responded that he did not know the origin of the athletic scholarship. It was something that was indigenous to Division I and Division II Intercollegiate Athletics. This institution has banded together with other institutions in the conference to provide athletic scholarships. There are other institutions in other conferences that have all aid based upon need, such as the Ivy League.

De Nault asked about remarks in item 4 of the report regarding the issue of the interpretation of the UNI policy on make-up work and missed classes.

Berg responded that the Committee is still wrestling with this issue. There is occasionally a student who is in a course where the instructor says that after three absences the fourth results in a lowering of the grade in the course. The University Policy states that students are permitted to miss classes for a University sanctioned event. The student feels that absences for the University sanctioned event should not count. The Professor's view is that more than three absences will result in a reduction of the grade in the course. The faculty member claims the right to establish his or her own ground rules. The student asserts the right to be protected by the University policy on absences. How is this to be handled?

Cooper stated that she had received a telephone call last week from a faculty member who could not find the policy anywhere. She asked where this policy was located.

De Nault stated that he had seen it in the Policies and Procedures Manual.

Berg recommended that the policy be printed in the Schedule of Classes.

Cooper thought that it should perhaps be stated in the Catalogue.

De Nault stated that it was a two-way street. Faculty are supposed to be notified in sufficient time to make allowances. He produced a letter from a coach stating that a student would be absent to compete in an athletic event that was delivered to him by a friend of the student the day of the event.

Berg stated that according to the existing policies this would not constitute sufficient notice.

De Nault stated that the issue that troubled him the most was placing a student between a professor and a coach. He was very uncomfortable with this. He felt that the coach should be the one contacting instructors about members of the team. He did not think it was right to put a student between a coach, who holds money over their head almost in a "blackmail-type" mode because they cannot miss a practice, and a professor who holds a grade over their head. Furthermore, why is a professor denied the right to require students to participate in a particular class activity. He had just returned from taking students in his Physical Geology course on a camping trip to Wisconsin to study the geology. Why should a student be able to miss this event because of an athletic contest. He told his students that they had to go, the activity was part of the experiential learning of the course. Why should this not have as much priority as an athletic event. He reiterated that students should not be put between faculty and money. Now that registration is computerized, coaches could inform faculty as soon as registration is over of conflicts before courses start. He is working now on his Spring syllabus. This involves careful sequencing the introduction of various concepts. A two week notice is not always sufficient time to make adjustments in a course.

Berg stated that it was possible to identify conflicts prior to the start of the semester and to notify the affected instructors, but the Committee felt that it should be the student's responsibility to notify their instructors. One of the things we want to teach is individual responsibility. While it may be that students are placed between the demands of coaches and instructors, this has not been brought out in exit interviews.

Ritrievi stated that the policy is that students cannot miss class for practice. The policy on missed classes only applies to events.

Gable remarked that the report states "some faculty, some coaches and some student-athletes continue to be dissatisfied with the policy (on make-up work and missed classes)". Gable asked what were the students complaints about the policy.

Ritrievi replied that some of the instructors are being unreasonable and are not following the policy as written. Some instructors disregard the policy even when they have been given adequate notice.

Wilkinson stated that one thing that often happens is that an instructor will allow all students in a course to miss two or three quizzes. The student-athlete will often feel that this is not fair because they no longer have the opportunity to do poorly on one of the other examinations. They have already used up their ability to exclude a quiz or exam in the final tabulation of the score for the course by being out on a University sanctioned event. The instructor feels that they have been accommodating and yet the student does not feel it is a true accommodation. This is where we get into grievance. The policy was changed in 1989 to include the grievance procedure for the student.

De Nault stated that it would be of great benefit to state both the policy on missed classes for an event and the policy that students cannot miss class for practice.

Soneson stated that there has been considerable discussion of this issue and it sounds like the Committee is considering a clarification of the issue. He would like the Committee to consider bringing a clarification to the Senate.

Reineke stated that important information for the Senate would be what you find out about other areas,

such as music, speech, theater, camp adventure. Most faculty feel that they provide context for all students who have competing activities; that we show a common flexibility toward whatever it may be, whether a theatrical production or an athlete event or an evening classes. For example, Halloween is a sacred event for many parents with children and she was quite understanding. For her, Halloween had as much priority as an athletic event for an athlete. However we negotiate the issue there should be a level playing field for everyone. If there are groups who do not feel that this is the case, this information should be brought to the Senate.

Berg stated that the Committee will be trying to consult with other groups.

Weeg asked about item 5, "scheduling of athletic contests and the consequent implications for days and classes missed by student-athletes", where it is stated that there have been difficulties in getting copies of the schedules of the athletic teams. She wondered why there was a problem

Berg responded that the problem is due to a lack of a process whereby the schedules automatically come to the committee. This is an issue the Committee should be able to work out.

Week expressed surprise that this information would not be given to the Committee.

Berg replied that there is a concern that in some sports students are missing too much school. Schedules in some of these sports are made up far in advance. In other sports, the schedules are not made up so far in advance. The Committee does not want coaches to set up events that conflict with any more classes than necessary.

Ritrievi stated that in baseball and softball, UNI joined a conference six years ago that has a very extensive competitive stance in those two sports. This has required many more contests than in the past. The Department of Athletics is concerned about the number of class days missed.

De Nault asked if the N.C.A.A. has any guidelines in the area of number of class days missed.

Ritrievi responded that the N.C.A.A. has a limit on the number of contests that can be played in a season. However, some sports, like golf and tennis, have split seasons.

Cooper asked about the restrictions on chewing tobacco in the classroom.

Ritrievi responded that the N.C.A.A. prohibits the use of any tobacco product by athletes, coaches, or officials during a practice or contest. There are no restrictions on tobacco products outside of practice sessions or an event.

Berg returned to the issue of missed classes. Athletics is going to take time to practice and participate. On the one hand, student athletes go to schedule classes so that their athletic activities will take as little time as possible from classes but on the other hand we are not willing to help them with priority registration. This forces student athletes, and others, to schedule and take courses that they otherwise would not take, substituting second or third choices for courses they would rather take in order to get schedules that would match with what they can do. Elimination of priority registration means that student-athletes are not getting the best education and in their missing more classes than they normally would.

Cooper responded that students who have outside jobs can make the same argument.

Primrose asked for the Committee to bring its recommendations to the Senate as soon as possible.

Primrose/McDevitt moved/seconded to receive the report. Motion carried.

CONSIDERATION OF DOCKETED ITEMS

- 558 632 The Senate request a meeting with the Chair of the University Committee on Curricula and any members of the committee that can attend on November 25, 1996 for the purpose of determining the authority of the University Committee on Curricula and to review the issue of offering "Work Experience" as an experimental, zero-credit course.

McDevitt/De Nault moved/seconded to approve the request.

De Nault reviewed the history of Senate discussion. He had brought the matter to the Senate so that they could formally discuss the issues raised at the last Senate meeting. Haack had obtained copies of the

pertinent minutes of the University Curricula Committee. If the motion passed, he would send these to Senators.

Gilpin moved to amend the motion by adding after "attend" the statement "and representatives of Student Services".

Gable noted that Haack had invited Don Doerr, Experiential Learning Coordinator, to attend the next Senate meeting.

Gilpin withdrew his motion.

McDevitt asked if there had been discussion about which non-academic units would be involved in reviewing student's work.

Soneson responded that this was one of several issues that needed to be discussed.

The motion to request a meeting with the Chair of the University Committee on Curricula and any members of the committee that can attend on November 25, 1996 for the purpose of determining the authority of the University Committee on Curricula and to review the issue of offering "Work Experience" as an experimental, zero-credit course, carried.

- 556 630 Request from Senator Reineke that the UNI Faculty Senate invite the Cabinet, as represented by one of their members, to join the Faculty Senate at their earliest convenience in order to share with us the Cabinet's timeline for eliminating pesticides from UNI's lawn care program.

Soneson/Van Wormer moved/seconded that the Faculty Senate invite the full Cabinet to join the Faculty Senate at their earliest convenience in order to share with use the Cabinet's timeline for eliminating pesticides from UNI's lawn care program

McDevitt asked what "at their earliest convenience" means.

Reineke responded that in the Spring the Senate had sent a communication to the Cabinet indicating that we wanted them to develop a timeline. Because we have not heard from them this was a polite way of suggesting that perhaps it was time.

McDevitt stated that this wording does not carry any closure.

Gable informed the Senate that earlier today she had been informed that the President apparently had not received the communication from the Senate on this issue. She went to the President's secretary and asked her to look into the matter.

Cooper asked when pesticides were to be applied again.

Soneson stated that the problem was not just pesticides outside, but also the use of pesticides inside buildings.

De Nault pointed out that the Senate has no authority over the Cabinet and to invite the Cabinet to share with us something they may or may not have adopted seems a little presumptuous. It would seem to be more appropriate to invite them to share with us whether they are going to have a timeline.

Reineke responded that the wording could be changed but her basic concern was that the University was a community and if colleagues are being sickened by herbicides then one thing communities do is to discuss issues of concern to individual members. The issue is one of communication.

Andy Abbott, NISG Vice President, stated that the Student Senate has sent three resolutions to the Cabinet on the issue of pesticide use. None of these communications has been answered.

De Nault/Soneson moved to amend by replacing "the Cabinet's" with "whether the Cabinet has a".

De Nault stated that amendment was in keeping with our authority and their authority. This asks if there is a timeline and if so, please share it.

Grosboll stated that it was unusual and not a very friendly request to invite the entire Cabinet. She felt that one representative would be able to discuss the issue adequately with the Senate.

Soneson replied that the Senate is hearing from a number of sources, such as the Student Senate, the Lab

School, and colleagues, and that they have appealed to the Cabinet. The Cabinet has remained silent on this issue. If they send one person, that person can say that they have talked about the concerns and we will talk about it again. The value of having the full Cabinet here is that we can converse with them and they will be engaged in the conversation. They will have our perspective. Various people who have been affected by this issue will be present. Thus, it is most appropriate for the full Cabinet to be here. We would be orchestrating the possibility for them to think through this issue. However busy they are, people's health is a stake here.

Motion to amend the motion on the floor by replacing "the Cabinet's" with "whether the Cabinet has a", carried.

Gable asked the Secretary to state the motion on the floor.

The motion on the floor is "to invite the full Cabinet to join the Faculty Senate at their earliest convenience in order to share with us whether the Cabinet has a timeline for eliminating pesticides from UNI's lawn care program."

Gilpin stated that there was a moral issue here. There is a consensus that we should not be killing people but there is also a concern of the exact role the Senate plays in this particular issue. He will support the motion but would prefer the Senate take the stance previously called "moral persuasion" rather than an imperative that implies that this body is the body that makes decisions about pesticide use. It is important to make our position known and to provide a forum in which the University Community may speak and make its wishes known. The Senate should sponsor a dialogue rather than positioning ourselves as an authoritarian body imposing its will.

Reineke agreed that the language should not suggest that the Senate dictates policy on this matter. The minutes would informally record that the tone of this entire conversation is one in which we request consultation in a forum where all voices can be heard. If the persons involved read the minutes of the Senate they will understand the context.

Soneson suggested amending the motion to reflect this tone.

Bozik agreed. The motion should not ask if they do or do not have a timeline but would you join with us in consultation on this issue.

Primrose supported sponsoring some type of open forum on the issue.

Weeg asked if the Americans with Disabilities Act Compliance Officer was a member of the Cabinet.

Gable responded that she did not think so.

Weeg suggested that this person should also be invited to the discussion.

De Nault/Thomas moved/seconded to substitute for the motion on the floor a motion for the Faculty Senate to invite the Cabinet to join the Faculty Senate at their earliest convenience in order to discuss elimination of pesticides from UNI's lawn care program.

Primrose asked for clarification. Are we interested in just pesticides in lawn care or the broader issue of pesticide use on campus.

Reineke responded that last Spring the Senate divided the issue to specifically address lawn care. This is a finite issue for which solutions can be found. The larger pesticide issue is far more complex.

Gable asked if members of the Physical Plant involved with pesticide use and lawn care should also be invited.

Soneson replied that John Conner is on the Cabinet and he would represent these groups.

Soneson asked if the persons getting sick were getting sick because of lawn pesticides or because of insecticides in buildings.

Reineke replied that the two persons in the communication were ill due to lawn pesticides.

Motion to substitute carried.

Main motion, to invite the Cabinet to join the Faculty Senate at their earliest convenience in order to

discuss elimination of pesticides from UNI's lawn care program, carried.

ADJOURNMENT

Primrose/Cooper moved/seconded to adjourn. Motion carried. The Senate adjourned at 5:11 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Kenneth J. De Nault

Kenneth J. De Nault, Secretary
University Faculty Senate

Minutes approved November 25, 1996